## ROSENTHAL, MONHAIT & GODDESS, P. A.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SUITE 1401, 919 MARKET STREET
P. O. BOX 1070
WILMINGTON, DELAWARE 19899-1070

JOSEPH A. ROSENTHAL NORMAN M. MONHAIT JEFFREY S. GODDESS CARMELLA P. KEENER EDWARD B. ROSENTHAL JESSICA ZELDIN TELEPHONE (302) 656-4433 FACSIMILE (302) 658-7567

October 4, 2006

## VIA ELECTRONIC FILING/HAND DELIVERY

The Hon. Kent A. Jordan United States District Court Federal Building 844 King Street Wilmington, Delaware 19801

Re: In re Tricor Direct Purchaser Antitrust Litigation; C.A. No. 05-340 (KAJ)

Teva Pharm. USA, Inc., et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, et. al. C.A. No. 02-1512 (KAJ)

Impax Laboratories, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, et al., C.A. No. 03-120 (KAJ)

In re Tricor Indirect Purchaser Antitrust Litigation; C.A. No. 05-360 (KAJ)

Dear Judge Jordan:

I am liaison counsel for the Consolidated Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs in the above-referenced coordinated antitrust actions (the "Actions"). I write to request the Court's intervention in a late-arising discovery dispute the parties have been unable to resolve, relating to the division of time for examination in certain depositions now shortly scheduled in the Actions. Hopefully this issue can be taken up in the discovery teleconference this Friday morning.

On September 7, 2006, Plaintiffs served counterclaim-plaintiffs Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., Teva Pharmaceuticals Industries Ltd. and Novopharm Ltd. (collectively, "Teva") and Impax Laboratories ("Impax") with substantially similar notices of deposition pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 30(b)(6), covering topics relevant to the generic drug manufacturers' development and sale of fenofibrate products. Both Teva and Impax agreed to offer witnesses in response to these notices.

Similarly, on June 29, 2006 and September 22, 2006, Defendants also served Rule 30(b)(6) notices on Teva and Impax, with topics significantly overlapping those included in Plaintiffs' notices.<sup>2</sup> For example, topic 3 of Plaintiffs' notice to Teva requests testimony regarding "Teva's sales and marketing of Generic Tricor, including the dates on which sales commenced and the marketing strategies considered and employed," while Defendants' notice demands a witness to

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Plaintiffs' 30(b)(6) notices are included in Exhibit A, attached hereto.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Defendants' 30(b)(6) notices are included, collectively, in Exhibit B, attached hereto.

The Hon. Kent A. Jordan October 4, 2006 Page 2

testify on "Teva's marketing plans and actual marketing of any Teva Fenofibrate Product, the persons with knowledge of such plans and marketing and documents which show Teva's marketing plans and actual marketing." (See Defendants' Notice dated September 22, 2006 at Topic 5). Notices directed to Impax display similar overlap.

Both Teva and Impax have begun to designate witnesses in response to these notices, and depositions have been scheduled. By letter dated September 11, 2006, Teva informed the parties that it would be designating a group of witnesses to collectively address these notices and would expect Plaintiffs and Defendants to share time in order to mitigate the burden on these witnesses. At the time, Defendants made no objection to Teva's request. Subsequently, Plaintiffs contacted Defendants to discuss an equitable use of time at these depositions and suggested that the available time be divided equally among the parties. Defendants flatly refused to discuss the issue, asserting baldly that they would "take up to our full allotment of time under the FRCP" and that this was appropriate "[g]iven the fact that plaintiffs sued us." Defendants refused to discuss any arrangement by which the parties could share time at these depositions.

Defendants' position is both an inefficient use of resources and an unreasonable burden on Teva and Impax, whom they apparently would have produce duplicative witnesses for another full day of deposition by the Plaintiffs. Importantly, the other plaintiff groups share a significant need for discovery from Teva and Impax, and they should not be given short shrift based solely upon their position on case caption, as Defendants would have. For example, both Direct and Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs must demonstrate, inter alia, the generic drug manufacturers were capable of developing, manufacturing and selling generic versions of Tricor at the relevant times, and would have, but for the success of Defendants' anticompetitive scheme. See, e.g. Direct Purchaser Class Plaintiffs' First Amended and Consolidated Class Action Complaint ¶¶ 5-7, 9. Moreover, Defendants' position clearly conflicts with the instructions of the Court's July 29, 2006 scheduling order, which requires that:

> Plaintiffs' Counsel and Defendants' Counsel of record shall coordinate in scheduling depositions so as to avoid, to the extent practicable, subjecting the same witness (except for Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses who may also have individual knowledge of the subject matter of the Coordinated Actions) to more than one deposition notice in the Coordinated Actions. No witness who is deposed subsequent to the date of the entry of this Order pursuant to a notice of deposition in one or more of the Coordinated Actions shall later be subject to deposition in any of the Coordinated Actions absent leave

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Plaintiffs' and Defendants' correspondence on this topic, via e-mail, is included collectively in Exhibit C, attached hereto.

The Hon. Kent A. Jordan October 4, 2006 Page 3

> of the Court or consent of the witness. Nothing in the Order should be construed to place limitations on the ability of a party to examine a witness at a deposition beyond those imposed by the F.R.C.P. All parties examining a witness at a deposition shall make reasonable efforts to avoid duplicative questioning.

See Pretrial Order No. 1 Regarding Consolidation of Direct Purchase Class Actions and Coordination of Direct Purchaser Class Actions with Direct Purchaser Individual Actions and Indirect Purchase Actions, dated July 29, 2006, at sec. IV. B.

Plaintiffs have already worked hard to comply with the requirements of the Court's order. Despite the fact that Plaintiffs in these coordinated cases comprise five distinct entities (or groups of entities) each with specific interests and goals in discovery, we have coordinated our discovery efforts such that no deposition of an Abbott or Fournier employee has exceeded seven hours, without prior agreement of Defendants. Defendants should not be excused from making the same commitment to efficiency and judicial economy where the burden of appearing for deposition falls upon the employees of another party. Accordingly, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court instruct the parties that time for the upcoming depositions of 30(b)(6) witnesses produced by Teva or Impax be equally divided between Plaintiffs and Defendants.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey S. Godders by gok Jeffrey S. Goddess (Del. Bar No. 630)

jgoddess@rmgglaw.com

(302) 656-4433

JSG/cmw Enclosures

cc: All counsel of record on attached service list

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 4, 2006 I electronically filed the foregoing document using CM/ECF, which will send notification of such filing to all registered participants, including:

Josy W. Ingersoll, Esquire
John W. Shaw, Esquire
Karen Keller, Esquire
Young Conaway Stargatt
& Taylor LLP
The Brandywine Building
1000 West Street, 17th Floor
P. O. Box 391
Wilmington, DE 19899-0391

Mary B. Graham, Esquire Morris, Nichols, Arsht & Tunnell LLP 1201 North Market Street P. O. Box 1347 Wilmington, DE 19899

Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esquire Anne Shea Gaza, Esquire Richards Layton & Finger One Rodney Square 920 North King Street Wilmington, DE 19801

Mary B. Matterer, Esquire Morris James Hitchens & Williams LLP 222 Delaware Avenue 10th Floor P. O. Box 2306 Wilmington, DE 19899

Pamela S. Tikellis, Esquire Robert J. Kriner, Jr., Esquire A. Zachary Naylor, Esquire Chimicles & Tikellis LLP One Rodney Square P. O. Box 1035 Wilmington, DE 19899

Jonathan L. Parshall, Esquire Murphy Spadaro & Landon 1011 Centre Road Suite 210 Wilmington, DE 19801

Elizabeth M. McGeever, Esquire Prickett Jones Elliott, P.A. 1310 King Street P. O. Box 1328 Wilmington, DE 19899 Michael I. Silverman, Esquire Lynn A. Iannone, Esquire Silverman & McDonald 1010 N. Bancroft Parkway #22 Wilmington, DE 19805 Patrick Francis Morris, Esquire Morris & Morris 1105 North Market Street Suite 803 Wilmington, DE 19801

I hereby certify that on October 4, 2006 I sent by electronic mail the foregoing document to the following non-registered participants:

REPRESENTING DIRECT PURCHASER CLASS (C.A. No. 05-340):

Bruce E. Gerstein bgerstein@garwingerstein.com

Barry S. Taus btaus@garwingerstein.com

Adam M. Steinfeld asteinfeld@garwingerstein.com

Rimma Neman rneman@garwingerstein.com

Daniel Berger danberger@bm.net

Eric L. Cramer ecramer@bm.net

Peter Kohn pkohn@bm.net

Neill W. Clark nclark@bm.net

Linda P. Nussbaum Inussbaum@cmht.com

Steig D. Olson solson@cmht.com

David P. Germaine dgermaine@vaneklaw.com

Joseph Vanek jvanek@vaneklaw.com

Stuart Des Roches stuart@odrlaw.com

Andrew Kelly akelly@odrlaw.com

Adelaida Ferchmin aferchmin@odrlaw.com

David P. Smith **dpsmith@psfllp.com** 

Russell A. Chorush rchorush@hpcllp.com

Michael F. Heim mheim@hpcllp.com

REPRESENTING WALGREEN, ECKERD, KROGER, MAXI, CVS, RITE AID (C.A. No. 05-340):

Elizabeth M. McGeever emmcgeever@prickett.com

Scott E. Perwin sperwin@kennynachwalter.com

Lauren Ravkind lravkind@kennynachwalter.com

Joseph T. Lukens jlukens@hangley.com

REPRESENTING PACIFICARE (C.A. No. 05-340):

Jonathan L. Parshall jonp@msllaw.com

William Christopher Carmody bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com

John Turner jturner@susmangodfrey.com

Shawn Rabin srabin@susmangodfrey.com

Justin Nelson jnelson@susmangodfrey.com

Ken Zylstra kzylstra@sbclasslaw.com

Lyle Stamps lstamps@sbclasslaw.com

Steve Connolly sconnolly@sbclasslaw.com

Casey Murphy cmurphy@sbclasslaw.com

Mark Sandman mms@rawlingsandassociates.com

Jeffrey Swann js5@rawlingsandassociates.com

REPRESENTING IMPAX LABORATORIES (C.A. No. 03-120)

Mary Matterer mmatterer@morrisjames.com

John C. Vetter jvetter@kenyon.com

Asim Bhansali abhansali@kvn.com

REPRESENTING INDIRECT PARTY PLAINTIFFS (C.A. No. 05-360):

Pamela S. Tikellis Thomas M. Sobol Patrick E. Cafferty Jeffery L. Kodroff Bernard J. Persky Michael Gottsch A. Zachary Naylor **Robert Davis Brian Clobes** Michael Tarringer Tim Fraser David Nalven Greg Matthews Christopher McDonald Kellie Safar Ted Lieverman Pat Howard

tricor@chimicles.com

Michael I. Silverman mike@silverman-mcdonald.psemail.com

Lynn A. Iannone lynn@silverman-mcdonald.psemail.com

Patrick Francis Morris pmorris@morrisandmorrislaw.com

REPRESENTING TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS (C.A. No. 02-1512):

Josy W. Ingersoll Bruce M. Gagala Karen E. Keller Christopher T. Holding Ken Cohen Elaine Blais tricor@ycst.com

REPRESENTING ABBOTT (ALL CASES):

Mary B. Graham tricor@mnat.com

William F. Cavanaugh wfcavanaugh@pbwt.com

Chad J. Peterman

cjpeterman@pbwt.com

REPRESENTING FOURNIER (ALL CASES):

Frederick L. Cottrell, III Anne Shea Gaza Steven S. Sunshine Matthew P. Hendrickson Bradley J. Demuth

Maggie DiMoscato Timothy C. Bickham tricor@rlf.com

## /s/ Jeffrey S. Goddess

Jeffrey S. Goddess (Del. Bar No. 630) Jessica Zeldin (Del. Bar No. 3558) Rosenthal, Monhait & Goddess, P.A. Suite 1401, 919 Market Street P. O. Box 1070 Wilmington, DE 19899-1070 (302) 656-4433 jgoddess@rmgglaw.com jzeldin@rmgglaw.com